

## CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-20 were originally submitted. Claims 11-15 are allowed. Also, claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 17, and 19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome 35 USC 112 objections for indefiniteness. However, the remaining claims 1, 2, 5-8, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103. The applicants herein have provided amendments to their claims without adding new matter, and now believe that they have also provided a definition of their invention in claims 1-10 and 16-20 that is distinguished from the cited prior art. A listing of the claims is enclosed with this response, with each claim marked as to its current status and amended claims showing the language added and deleted respectively with underlining and strike-through markings.

During the amendment of their claims, instead of canceling claims 1 and 16 and importing the subject matter therein to allowable claims 9 and 19 depending respectively therefrom, as proposed by the Examiner, the applicants did the reverse and imported the original subject matter relating to debris cutters from claims 9 and 19 respectively into claims 1 and 16, so that claims 1 and 16 would instead be considered allowable. Claims 9 and 19 were then amended to include other subject matter from the specification. Since this amendment strategy preserved much of the original claim language, to the applicants it appeared to be the most straightforward approach.